



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,059	10/27/2003	Kevin J. McMahan	MCK 301	6010

23581 7590 02/24/2005  
KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.  
520 S.W. YAMHILL STREET  
SUITE 200  
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

CHAN, KO HUNG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3632

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/695,059

Applicant(s)

MCMAHAN, KEVIN J.

Examiner

Korie H. Chan

Art Unit

3632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/2/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: figures 1-10 and figures 11-12.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1 and 20 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over

Art Unit: 3632

the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant's election filed 9/7/2004 to the examiner's restriction was incomplete as applicant fail to elect the figure number and the corresponding claims identifying the elected specie.

During a telephone conversation with Michelle Turner for Peter Heuser on February 3, 2005 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of figure 1-10, claims 1-10. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 11-21 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Regarding claim 9, line 2, "wherein (L)" is vague and indefinite since what is in parenthesis is normally not part of the claim. Examiner suggest replacing "(L)" with - - said distance - -.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3632

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Heiges (US patent no. 5,279,063). Heiges discloses a decoy stand comprising a base (16, figure 1) having a closed ring structure (42, figure 2) with a cross-piece (40) connecting the sides of the ring, a pivot rod (24 and 28) extending normal to the base, a mounting plate (34) pivot about the pivot rod (at 36), a cantilever arm (18) extending from base and coupling the pivot rod to the base and configured to bend and twist; wherein the arm is spaced a distance (27) from the cross-piece.

Claims 1, 2, and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ottolini (US patent no. 2,941,331). Ottolini discloses a decoy stand comprising a base (2, figure 1) having a closed ring structure with a cross-piece (cross piece to which 6 is connected, figure 1 and 2) connecting the sides of the ring, a pivot rod (8) extending normal to the base, a mounting plate (12) inherently capable of pivot about the pivot rod (note 16 is loosely held on top of 18 and thus is inherently capable of pivot thereabove), a cantilever arm (6) extending from base and coupling the pivot rod to the base and configured to bend and inherently capable of twisting; wherein the arm is spaced a distance (27) from the cross-piece bottom portion (figure 2).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3632

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ottolini (US patent no. 2,941,331) in view of Schiffmann (US patent no. 1,730,168). Ottolini disclosed all the claimed features of applicant's invention except for the base as being H-shaped. To provide for H-shaped base is notoriously old and well-known in the art. Schiffmann discloses a stand with H-shaped base. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modify the base of Ottolini such that it is H-shaped. Such modification would have involved a mere substitution of one well-known shaped base for another which is thought to be within the ambit of one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 3-5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Conclusion***


The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art of record demonstrate various amusement device with bendable arm and decoy stands.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Korie H. Chan whose telephone number is 703-305-8079. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday.

Art Unit: 3632

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leslie Braun can be reached on 703-308-2156. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Korie H. Chan  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3632

khc  
February 16, 2004